

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
17 May 1972

AM

10:00

I. CONVENE, 708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.

II. ADMINISTRATION

- a. Approval of Minutes of April Meeting
- b. Date of Next Meeting: 21 June 1972
- c. Reappointment of Mr. Stohlman and Mr. Vanderpool to Old Georgetown Board of Architects for additional three year term.

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

- a. National Air and Space Museum - Revised Design
- b. Proposed Presidential Portrait for U.S. Courthouse and Federal Building, Rochester, N.Y.

2. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency

- a. Transportation Square Office Building - Revised Design
- b. Brookland Enterprise, Restaurant-Banquet Facility, "C" Deck, S.W. Waterfront - Proposed Design
- c. Cannon's Seafood, Store and Carry-out, "C" Deck, S.W. Waterfront - Proposed Design

3. National Science Foundation

National Science Foundation Seal

4. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

a. Old Georgetown Act

(1) Appendix 1

(2) OG 72-151, 1055 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W., Proposed Office Building - Revised Design

(3) OG 72-154, 3800 Reservoir Rd., N.W., Concentrated Care Center Hospital, Georgetown University - Proposed Design

b. Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Appendix 2

IV. INTERVIEWS

- 11:30 1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service
National Air and Space Museum - Revised Design.
- 11:45 2. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
Transportation Square Office Building - Revised Design
- 12:00 3. D.C. Government, Dept. of Economic Development
a. OG 72-151, 1055 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W., Proposed
Office Building - Revised Design
- 12:15 b. OG 72-154, 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W., Concentrated Care
Center Hospital, Georgetown University - Proposed Design
- 12:30 4. D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
a. Brookland Enterprise, Restaurant-Banquet Facility,
"C" Deck, S.W. Waterfront - Proposed Design
b. Cannons Seafood, Store and Carry-out, "C" Deck, S.W.
Waterfront - Proposed Design

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
17 May 1972

Meeting convened at 10:00 at the Commission of Fine Arts offices
at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members Present:

Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Hon. Jane Dart
Hon. Kevin Roche
Hon. Chloethiel Woodard Smith
Hon. Edward D. Stone Jr.

Staff Present:

Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary
Mr. Jeffrey Carson
Mr. J. L. Sibley Jennings Jr.
Miss Marylyn Shaw
Miss Lynda Smith

National Capital Planning

Commission Staff present:

Mr. Edward Hromanick
Mr. David McKinnon

I. ADMINISTRATION

a. Minutes for April, 1972, Meeting, approved.

b. Date of Next Meeting, 12 July 1972.

c. Reappointment of Mr. Thomas Stohlman and Mr. Wynant Vanderpool
to Old Georgetown Board of Architects for additional three year terms.
The Secretary recommended reappointment of these members and the Commission
so acted with an expression of thanks for the Board's time consuming effort.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

a. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

1. National Air and Space Museum, the Mall at 7th St., S.W., -
revised design, Gyo Obata, Architect. The Assistant Secretary presented
drawings reflecting changes based on Commission of Fine Arts recommenda-
tions made at the April meeting. The long rectangular building retained
a series of marble clad solids interspersed by glass fronted and topped
voids, but was now shown on a more monumental terraced base with wider
entrance stairs. The end glass areas had been extended up and into the
roof, and glass now surrounded three cantilever Independence Avenue
masses, as had been suggested by the Commission. The stone facade
elements showed horizontal divisions at five foot intervals and the
pronounced accent vertical slots had been eliminated from the South

facade. The Chairman questioned the stone course details, and Mr. Stone requested more landscape effort, to provide a more dynamic element in conjunction with the terraces. Mr. Roche stated that he felt the redesign much more successful - the other members concurred. Further discussion was put off until a session with the Architect later in the morning.

2. Proposed Presidential Portrait for U. S. Courthouse and Federal Building in Rochester, New York. The Secretary presented photographs of portraits by Mr. Stanley Gordon, of Rochester, and indicated that a group of local businessmen were sponsoring a portrait of President Nixon to hang in Rochester's new Federal Building. The members suggested that the project be recommended against and that the probable likeness resulting would be of no more value than the official photograph now used in Federal Buildings. (Exhibit A)

b. Redevelopment Land Agency

1. Transportation Square Office Building, 6th and Maryland Avenue, S.W., Revised Design, Edward Durrell Stone, Architect. Mr. Edward Stone Jr. was absent from the room during discussion of this project, because the design had been prepared by his father's firm.

The Assistant Secretary presented drawings of a revised scheme for this multi-floored marble-clad commercial office structure and showed photographs of the model of the previous, disapproved scheme. An objectionable protrusion at the bottom of the building had been eliminated and the scheme slightly expanded to the North to recover usable space. The Commission agreed that the revised design was much better than the previous scheme and approved it. Since the scheme was approved and the Commission had no questions, the Architect and Sponsors were notified that it would not be necessary to appear before the Commission. (Exhibit B)

2. Brookland Enterprise, Restaurant-Banquet Facility, "C" Deck, S.W. Waterfront - proposed design, McDonald, Williams and Marshall, Architects. The Secretary presented drawings and referred to a model of the Maine Avenue, S.W. waterfront. The design was for a three floor restaurant with banquet facilities on the first floor, restaurant dining rooms on the second floor and a cocktail lounge on the third floor. The brick building had a standing seam mansard roof, a theme common to this area's development. The Commission examined the plans and felt that the facility was poorly planned and raised serious questions about its potential for functioning at all. The Secretary stated that the Redevelopment Land Agency had submitted the plans without resolving certain questions about allowable area for this facility. The Chairman suggested that the Commission refuse to act on the submission until the internal questions between the R.L.A. and Developers could be resolved,

and that the Commission in the meantime might point out the potential inefficiencies of the scheme as presented. The members agreed and representatives from the project were notified that it would be unnecessary to attend the meeting. (Exhibit C)

3. Cannon's Seafood, Store and Carry-out, "C" Deck, S.W., Waterfront proposed design, Perkins and Will, Architects. The Secretary showed several preliminary drawings for this one floor facility to be built next to the Brookland Enterprises Restaurant-Banquet facility. He stated that this presentation was for the Commission's information only and that no date had been set for a formal submission of this project. The Commission took no action. (Exhibit C)

c. National Science Foundation, National Science Foundation Seal, the Secretary presented three designs for use by this agency in response to a request for advice by the Director, Mr. H. Guyford Stever. One design in full color, showed a view of the world surrounded by stylized headless human figures hand-to-hand in turn, surrounded with the words "National Science Foundation". Two other drawings represented black and white designs with the initials "n.s.f." in the center in place of the world. The members felt that the design was not inspired and agreed to recommend restudy. They specifically did not like the use of the world, the "cog", and the style of lettering. (Exhibit D)

d. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

1. Old Georgetown Act

(a.) Appendix 1, approved. (Exhibit E)

(b.) OG 72-151, 1055 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W., proposed office building, revised design. Arthur Cotton Moore and Associates, Architect. The Secretary presented models and drawings of the revised design and the previous design for this proposed dark brick multi-floor commercial and office building along the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. Previously the Commission had inspected the site and examined a design taking the action that the scheme presented was too high for the historic location. The revised design was the same basic scheme with fifteen feet in height removed. The Commission examined the models and drawings and stated their preference for the new scheme and their admiration for the quality and sensitivity of the solution which left open space next to the Canal and preserved the historic Duvall Foundry as part of the site development. Further comments were withheld until an interview with the architect later in the morning.

(c.) OG 72-153, 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W., Concentrated Care Center Hospital, Georgetown University - proposed building, revised design, Smith, Hinchman and Grylles, Architects. The Assistant Secretary presented drawings of this proposed hospital facility and brought the Commission up to date on the history of previous disapprovals for this project, stating that most previous objections were based on scale problems with respect to harmonizing with an existing variety of buildings

on the site. Mr. Roche stated that the primary difficulty in the past had been the floor-to-floor height caused by an intermediate mechanical floor between each hospital floor. The Commission examined the material presented and found that the current proposal with three concrete frame wings had brick infill panels and a similar character to the buildings built nearby in recent years. Missing on the current scheme were the obvious blank mechanical floors and a heavy Southern deck which had been specifically objected to in the past. The Commission approved the designs as submitted. The University officials were notified that an interview would not be necessary.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act, Appendix 2, approved.(Exhibit F)

III. INTERVIEWS

a. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service, National Air and Space Museum, revised design. The project was represented by Dr. Bradley, of the Smithsonian Institution, Michael Collins, Director, Space Museum, and Gyo Obata, the Architect. The Chairman welcomed the architect, Mr. Obata, and indicated that the Commission had been very pleased by the redesign and was approving it provided further details would be submitted as developed, particularly with respect to the landscaping. Mr. Obata agreed. The Chairman asked how the marble on the facade was to be coursed and the architect responded that it would be channeled over the steel structure in staggered rows with mortar joints at five floor vertical intervals. The Commission commended the Director of the Space Museum, Mr. Collins, and all concerned on their industry in pursuing the best possible design.

b. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development, OG 72-151, 1055 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W., Office Building - revised design. The project was represented by the architect, Arthur Cotton Moore; the landscape architect, Hideo Sasaki; and the Ownership, Mr. Robert C. Larson. The Chairman invited Mr. Moore forward and Mr. Moore responded with a statement, (enclosed as an exhibit). The Chairman thanked the architect and the developer for their conscientious effort to conform to the historic character of the area and the Commission's previous action, and stated the Commission's approval of the revised scheme. (Chairman's statement as exhibit from transcript.)(ExhibitG).

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 12:10.



Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

May 19, 1972

Dear Mr. Sampson:

At its meeting on May 17th the Commission of Fine Arts considered your letter in which a portrait of President Nixon to be painted by Mr. Stanley Gordon was proposed for the U.S. Courthouse and Federal Building in Rochester, N.Y.. It was felt that the quality of the artist's work as illustrated by the photographs that were enclosed was not sufficiently distinguished.

We feel that only an official portrait of the President should be displayed in a Federal building and that this is a matter for consideration by the White House.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Arthur F. Sampson
Commissioner
Public Buildings
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit A.

May 19, 1972

Dear Mr. Mister:

I am writing to report the Commission of Fine Art's approval on May 17th of revised preliminary designs for the Transportation Square Office Building on Maryland Avenue, S.W. It would probably be useful to let the architects and owners know that final plans will also have to be submitted to the Commission for review under provisions of the Shipstead Luce Act prior to issuance of a building permit. This is to ensure that the final designs do not deviate in any marked way from the preliminary drawings.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown

Mr. Melvin A. Mister
Executive Director
D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
1325 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit B.

May 19, 1972

Dear Mr. Mister:

I am writing in regard to the proposals for the Brookland Enterprise Restaurant Facility and Cannon's Seafood Store to be located on C Deck, S.W. Waterfront.

The Commission of Fine Arts feels that any comment on the design of these projects would be premature and inappropriate, since the proposed plans do not conform to the original requirements set forth for the development of these parcels. Our next meeting is scheduled for July 12th and we would be happy to review the designs at that time if this issue has been resolved.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Melvin A. Mister
Executive Director
D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
1325 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit C.

May 19, 1972

Dear Mr. Stever:

The designs for the National Science Foundation seal were discussed at the Commission's meeting on May 17th. We were most appreciative of the Foundation's obvious interest in achieving a distinctive design, and feel that the Foundation, by giving the question serious attention, could well set a pace for other Government agencies.

The Commission felt, however, that the particular design presented, while above many already in use by Government agencies, was not sufficiently distinguished.

The Commission also took note of the explanation of the symbolism, but felt that uninitiated viewers might possibly find in the design certain inappropriate implications, such as man represented with a body but not a head, a cog-like pattern reminiscent of 19th century industrialization, and the very literal depiction of the hemisphere, which might not be without its own imperial overtones.

We recommend a fresh start with the hope that a more suitable design can be achieved. We will be meeting again on July 12th and will be happy to review any designs at that time.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Dr. H. Guyford Stever
Director
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20550

Exhibit D.

17 May 1972

<u>NO</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
72-		
136	1200 Wisconsin Ave., N.W. National Bank of Washington	Install two sets 15"x25'7" overall individual bronze letters
ACTION: Issue permit. 4/26/72		
137	3132 M St., N.W. Norddeutscher Rundfunk	Structural repair at above address. Brick sample to be approved by Fine Arts Commission.
ACTION: Issue permit. 4/26/72		
138	3340 N St., N.W. Eugene Frank	Gas lamps in connection w/step area
ACTION: Issue permit for 2 gas lamps; one wall mounted Veritas and one pole mounted #20. 4/26/72		
139	3800 Reservoir Rd., N.W. Georgetown University	Roof air conditioning unit enclosure.
ACTION: Do not issue permit. No objection to the scheme as presented, but request material and color sample with good color photo of existing bldg. prior to approval. 4/26/72		
140	3400 R St., N.W.	Base for CAC on roof.
141	3402 R St., N.W.	
142	3404 R St., N.W.	
143	3406 R St., N.W. R. Eldridge	
ACTION: Issue permit. 4/26/72		
144	3405-3423 M St., N.W. John Snyder and Samuel Levy	remodeling fronts of ten buildings
ACTION: Do not issue permit. Scheme as submitted approved subject to submission of facade plan, millwork details and clear exact scale drawings of all proposed changes to exteriors. 4/26/72		
145	3301 M St., N.W. Douglas Williams	Sign
ACTION: Do not issue. Scheme approved w/suggestion that all ltrs be upper case and that support poles be located on ends of sign. High light poles not recommended, suggest lights suspended from and concealed behind rear of sign. 4/26/72		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

17 May 1972

146

3301 M St., NW
Douglas Williams

One d/f internally lighted display cabinet to be simulated duranodic bronze finished face to be stencil cut, letter openings to be backed with 1/8" thick plexiglas.

ACTION: Do not issue. Size and shape of sign not appropriate. Recm alternate scheme. See OG 72-145

147

3028 Dent Place, N.W.
Lohua Wakefield

Put new siding and windows on rear sun porch.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Design of proposed changes not recommended. Character of existing wall and windows preferable. Recommend rehabilitating existing work, perhaps blocking a window or two on the ends.
5/11/72

148

1519 34th St., N.W.
Daniel L. Rumsey

Change roof 3rd floor to add bedroom and bath. Add windows, etc.

ACTION: Issue permit. 5/11/72

149

3146 1/2 O St., N.W.
Alfred R. Sugg

Tear down present wooden porch and replace w/brick porch.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. No objection to removal of wooden porch. Design not recommended, dwgs unclear. Permit for pole lamp will require exact information as to height and design, perhaps pictures of product intended. 5/11/72

150

2725 N St., N.W.
Richard Green

Erect screening of type recommendable, to cover air conditioning unit on roof of job.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Recm another location or screening w/lattice. 5/11/72

152

2903 Q St., N.W.
Alvaro Garcia Pena

Install balcony and prefabricated fireplace enclosure including flue at rear of bldg.

ACTION: Issue permit. Recm flue stack be painted black. 5/11/72

153

3301 M St., N.W.
Williams Chevrolet

1 s/f internally lighted stencil cut duranodic bronze sign w/white plexiglas letters on 2 poles.

ACTION: Issue permit. 5/11/72

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

17 May 1972

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
------------	--------------------------	----------------

SL 72-		
39	1115 Pa. Ave., N.W. Home Federal Savings	Two aluminum signs w/white plastic letters.
ACTION: Approved, 4/20/72		

40	201 East Capitol Street Folger Shakespeare Library	Sign
ACTION: Approved, 4/20/72		

42	1703 New York Ave., N.W. Diplomat Parking	One s/f stencil cut aluminum face plexiglas letter internally lighted simulated duranodic finish display installed at soffit of parking garage entrance. Size 1'4" x 17'0" - 22.66 ft.
ACTION: Issue permit. 5/11/72		

43	1709 N.Y. Ave., N.W. Lenkin Realty	Sign
ACTION: Issue permit: no objection. 5/11/72		

44	733 15th St., N.W. Woodward Liquor Inc.	Individual letters interior illuminated on facia of bldg.
ACTION: Do not issue permit. Hanging sign 42" away from bldg. on raceway not recommended. Placing signs on different levels or across bldg. corner not recommended. Exact typeface unclear from material submitted. 5/11/72		

45	2700 Brandywine St., N.W. Mr. and Mrs. Alan Y. Naftalin	New 3 bedroom residence with enclosed swimming pool and enclosed garage.
ACTION: Issue permit. 5/11/72		

46	2510 Rock Creek Drive, N.W.	Single family residence
ACTION: No objection to design. Request submission of brick sample prior to issuance of permit. 5/16/72		

May 19, 1972

Dear Mr. Sampson:

I am glad to report that the Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on May 17th, approved revised preliminary designs for the National Air and Space Museum. This action completes the review of the project for this stage.

In developing the detailed drawings we recommended to the architect that further study be given the terraced planting surrounding the base of the building. We would also hope that the entrance way from the Mall could be further emphasized. We believe this can be accomplished in part by extending the panel of trees along the Mall closer to the entrance way, thus framing it in the same manner as the National Gallery.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend our appreciation to the architect for the time and effort he has put into the many revisions and studies that were made at the Commission's suggestions. We hope you agree that it has been a worthwhile effort.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Arthur F. Sampson
Commissioner
Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit F.

poles. They found they could do it within the budget they have.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: That's great.

MR. ATHERTON: They are moving back and lowering those lights on that sort of secondary grass panel, so it follows pretty well along the comments that were made at the inspection.

(1055 Jefferson Street)

MR. MOORE: Thank you for this opportunity. At our revised submission which you see here, we're submitting a submission here which is retained for basic design concept. We feel both you approved of and the Georgetown Panel has approved of it. Yet we restudied the program and found a way to reduce the height significantly in order to bring it into sympathy with the surrounding area.

Now it is apparent we retained these key elements, preserving the old foundry, terracing away from the canal and yet we have in effect reduced the building three stories from what is permitted under zoning.

MR. MOORE: As you've seen, Hideo Sasaki, who was working with us, is here, so is Robert Larson, representative of the owner, and they can answer questions also.

What I would specifically like to comment on is the question of the zoning and sectional development planning efforts. Since I understand that the Executive Director of NCPC, Mr. Conrad, requested that you broaden your considerations to include those planning efforts, in his presentation that he made before you reviewed our initial submission last month, and the Georgetown Inland Corporation, the owner, has consistently indicated full cooperation and support for the concept of a coordinated public-private planning process for the lower Georgetown area. In fact, in late 1970, we agreed at the request of Mr. Conrad to delay our development planning for six months, during which time we were assured rather constantly that the planning process would be implemented. It's now been more than 20 months since that time, and while we are continuing to offer our assistance and cooperation, we frankly can no longer delay our development activities for the following reasons:

One, the study is just now getting underway and cannot be completed under even the most optimistic assumptions before the end of 1972.

Second, the first phase of the study is directed primarily at highway planning and will deal only incidentally and inconclusively with issues of use, density and height. That already is a month late.

Sectional development planning has no real precedents in the District of Columbia, and at this point it is only possible to speculate, regarding the practical implementations and/or implementations once this study is completed.

Now any change involving zoning would of course require after this process, extensive NCPC review, Zoning Commission review, and public hearing and possible litigation. As a result, definitive action, we feel, is at best years away.

Finally, we believe of course the proposed design is consistent both with existing zoning and a definite response to the unique character of the site and we feel it really anticipates some of the development objectives that are likely to be identified in the planning process.

While we believe this sectional development planning consideration is somewhat incidental to your review, we nonetheless appreciate the opportunity to place in perspective these planning issues.

I will be glad to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much. Well, I'd like to report on the findings of the Commission. We have studied this plan now on two occasions, which included a site visit on the last one, and have come up with a unanimous approval of the new design. We commend the architect and the owner for

their willingness to restudy and although in an ideal world, we think the extra four feet of this cornice line going up is probably not in the best interests of Georgetown, we are willing to accept it in view of the excellence of the design in every other respect.

We think the building has been greatly improved esthetically, both from the canal and from the Thomas Jefferson Street side, where the apparent height has been greatly reduced, and the modular rhythm of those bays really partakes of the character of the Federal period architecture in the surrounding neighborhood.

The sensitivity with which the canal has been respected and with which the building has pulled back from its property line to cup the space there and give expression to a sense of place is something that we are very appreciative of and commend very highly.

We reiterate our approval of the ways in which the building allows the space to interpenetrate inside it, and pedestrian traffic to flow in and out, and the respect that has been shown the foundry on the site, the Duval Foundry on the site.

We think the materials will be appropriate. We commend the concept of having curtains, fabrics under control:

and in general, feel that it will be a building of considerable architectural distinction which will be a great contribution to the Georgetown scene.

I should point out in response to the architect's statement that planning considerations are really not our specific mandate and in terms of a design submission, in our letter to you we have not made reference to the plans for an overall design study although naturally the Commission applauds anything that will get a historic area studied and its participants cooperating with each other. But we have examined this building on its own merits, as it relates to its immediate environmental surroundings, and feel that this is as intelligent and sensitive solution as we can hope for.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Brown.

MR. LARSON: On behalf of the owners, I would like to thank the Commission not only for their objection but for the very helpful way in which you have worked with us in reaching this conclusion. It is a very positive kind of experience for us.

MR. SASAKI: I'm glad I came.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Do we have anything else?

MR. ATHERTON: I think that will conclude the business. Since the other has been eliminated, that will be the final interview.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 o'clock, p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)

6 June, 1972

Mr. S. A. Caputo
Deputy Director of General Services
Government of the District of Columbia
613 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Mr. Caputo:

In response to your inquiry about architectural models for the Commission of Fine Arts presentations we can give you the following comments. This Commission, unlike the Planning Commission, does not require exactly identical, nor predictable materials for every project. Each project is judged, rather on its own merits. Generally our preliminary conversations with Mr. Pavlick and the project architects determine just what may be required for a particular project.

Study models rather than elaborate finished models, if needed at all, will be adequate to give the Commission a feel for the geometry and massing of a proposal. We prefer a set of mounted drawings for presentation to the Commission and a duplicate set of prints for our files. The mounted drawings can be returned to the architect. These drawings should generally include landscaping, site planning, elevations, location of mechanical equipment, (on exterior or roof), plans, etc. In short, the presentation material should very well describe the project's appearance in relation to its surroundings as well as material colors, massing, etc.

Since a good number of top designs have been compromised in the past by indiscriminate use of clumsy window details, random high intensity floodlights, chain link fencing and paving where there should be planting, it might be a good idea to pin some of these things down before presentation to the Commission. The Commission would be glad to assist with these house-keeping details to insure the success of these projects. It is this type of detail which really affects the quality of a design in the end, and its environmental success.

Sincerely yours,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

